



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,499	08/01/2003	Frank Olischewski	21295.59(H56-44US)	4405
29127	7590	12/26/2008		
HOUSTON ELISEEVA				
4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4				
LEXINGTON, MA 02421				
EXAMINER				
ROSARIO, DENNIS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/26/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to After Final Amendment***

1. The after final amendment was received on 12/4/08. Claims 1-11 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/4/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants state that Fogg cannot be modified to operate on original captured image. The examiner respectfully disagrees since given the broadest reasonable interpretation, Fogg does operate on original captured images as shown upon the output of fig. 4: "Bitstream Data" and "Decoded Samples" which are captured via fig. 4:401 that can be a receiver that intercepts to capture signal transmissions thrown from an unspecified signal source and operated upon via fig. 4:402. Thus, in a very broad sense, Fogg does not even need to be modified to operate on an original captured image. Given that the claims were interpreted in a limiting fashion meaning the original image was captured the very second a shutter button was pressed so as to be operated upon, Nybo was used. However, Nybo appears not necessary to show operating on original captured images, because Fogg was broadly characterized, above, in that fashion.

Applicants state that Fogg teaches away from the present invention by relying on the input being different from the original captured images. This argument appears to be an oxymoron statement. How is an input different from the original captured images given the examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of Fogg? The examiner can

see a difference if the claims were interpreted in a limiting fashion via the unspecified shutter button without compression/decompression, but no feature is claimed.

Applicants state that the combination does not allow implementing of the claimed limitations on optically acquired images. Again, how can an image be captured without optics? Even if Fogg or Nybo does not mention the word "optics", optics is an inherent feature of images. Without optics, the world is blind. Thus again, in a broad sense, Nybo is redundant.

Applicants state that Fogg teaches raw elements and intermediary elements provides their own interpretation of what each is. The examiner has already provided a separate interpretation of what each is and maintains the interpretation.

/Dennis Rosario/

Examiner, Art Unit 2624